



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF FIFTEEN ON GRAMMATICAL
NOMENCLATURE.

The Report to be made is one of "progress" in the technical sense. But it is also a story of passage through perplexities.

The history of the movement which our committee represents is an interesting one, and all the more so since it is already clear that the efforts to bring about reform will ultimately be of an international character. I hope you will allow me to sketch the story briefly.

Every one knows the confusion caused by the existence of a variety of terminology for nearly everything with which grammar has to deal. The French were the first to attempt a remedy. A Committee of Fifteen was appointed in 1906, charged with the duty of recommending a uniform system of nomenclature for French grammar. It reported in 1907 (8) and 1909. The result was a ministerial circular, put out in printed form in 1910, under the title *La nouvelle nomenclature grammaticale*.

In the same year in which the French movement started, a similar movement, but from a point of view commanding a wider field, started in this Association. It resulted, at your meeting of December 28, 1906, in the passage of resolutions offered by Professor Loiseaux of Columbia University, and seconded or supported by Mr. Remy, of the Commercial High School of Brooklyn, Mr. Kagan of the Roxbury High School, Boston, Professor Cohn of Columbia University, and Professor Collitz, then of Bryn Mawr College.

The text of the resolutions was as follows:

"That a committee, consisting of fifteen representatives, three each for English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish, be appointed by the Executive Council of the Association.

"That such a committee devise a uniform system of grammatical terminology—or as nearly uniform a system for each language, or group of languages, as can be contrived—and report to the Association at its next meeting, or as soon as practicable thereafter."

The fifteen representatives were afterward appointed by the Executive Council, with Professor Loiseaux as chairman.

The Modern Language Association of America was thus the first in the world to make a movement in favor of a uniform grammatical terminology for several languages. This is an interesting and gratifying fact.

Unhappily, however, an additional task which was laid upon your committee (that of arranging lists of texts, graded according to

difficulty, for reading in the schools) occupied its attention for four years, and made us therefore not the first nation, but the third, to take up a scheme of reform embracing the nomenclature of several languages.

An English Joint Committee upon grammatical terminology was appointed in 1908. This was to cover the field for English, German, French, Latin, and Greek. It proceeded at once to its work, and made a preliminary report in 1909, and a finished one in 1910.

At the annual meeting of the Modern Language men of Germany in 1910, Director Dörr, of Frankfort, presented a paper on the simplification of grammatical terminology, and was then empowered to form a committee for the study of terminology in German, English, French, and Italian grammar. This committee was expected to hold correspondence with the French and English committees, and with local German committees that might be organized, and to report in two years.

The December number of *Die neueren Sprachen*, just now received, brings the news that the Neuphilologen-Verein of Vienna, after listening to a paper by Professor Arthur Brandeis, has appointed a committee upon grammatical terminology, the members of which are to represent Greek, Latin, German, English, and French.

At your meeting of a year ago, your Committee of Fifteen reported the completion of the second task which had been assigned to it. You were then good enough to listen to a paper of mine on *The Harmonizing of Grammatical Nomenclature*.

I had been working for more than a quarter of a century in the belief not only that the grammatical *ideas* in the languages of our common Indo-European family are in the main identical, but that, to a large degree, *the ways in which these are expressed* are identical,—with a large amount of identity, again, even in the divergences which have taken place in this and that language. I had been intending some day to put out a scheme which would illustrate this, and in which I should present a common terminology, so far as the ways of expression correspond. A year before I addressed you, I gave a paper upon the subject at the meeting of the American Philological Association. My hope, when a committee for the carrying out of such a plan had been appointed in England, was that a similar committee might be appointed here, by which the grammatical terminology both of the modern and the ancient languages might be studied. To prepare the way for coöperation in case your Association should take the matter up (though I did not know then of the existence of your committee), I offered a resolution before the American Philological Association on the day before I addressed

you, to the effect that the Executive Committee should be authorized, in the event of a request for coöperation, to appoint representatives. It had not at the time occurred to me that a Classical man could in any way be associated with your work except through coöperation between the Associations. The matter, however, took a turn quite unexpected by me, in that I was appointed a member of your committee.

After that committee had discharged its secondary labors, Professor Loiseaux found himself unable to give more time, and resigned. It was certainly undeserved that he should have had to carry the committee through four years of a task for which he had not moved its appointment, only to be obliged to resign when the original task was taken up.

In the latter part of February I received notice that I had been appointed chairman of your committee,—a mark of confidence, or at least of hope, for which I am not able adequately to express my gratitude.

I at once entered upon correspondence with the other members of the committee, asking for suggestions with regard to the method of work, and myself sketching them as they appeared to me. In the midst of this, I learned that Mr. C. R. Rounds, of the Normal School at Whitewater, Wis., had published in the *Educational Review* for June, 1910, a paper on "The Varying Terminology of English Grammar," and that, at the meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association in February, 1910, his labors had borne fruit in the appointment of a Committee of Five to bring in a system of nomenclature for English grammar. Mr. Rounds had expressed the hope that the task would be completed within a year.

There were thus in existence two independent and unrelated committees for the study of the terminology of English grammar, one of the two being charged also with the duty of dealing with the terminology of the other modern languages studied in our schools. This seemed an unsatisfactory state of affairs. It would be unfortunate if two separate and differing sets of recommendations should finally appear; it would be unfortunate if the terminology of English grammar should be studied without reference to the other linguistic work of the students in our schools; and it was clearly desirable that whatever light the discussion might present for the common subject, English, should be shared by all those who were at work upon the problem. Moreover, there was no provision for the study of the terminology of Latin and Greek grammar; so that whatever gains might be made for the teaching of the other languages in our schools would run the risk of being broken in upon

by the teaching of a different terminology, or different terminologies, for these two languages. It accordingly seemed best to endeavor now to bring about coöperation on the part of the three leading bodies of the country that deal with language,—the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association of America, and the American Philological Association. My efforts, therefore, under the approval of your President and Secretary, were directed to this end. Meanwhile, inasmuch as I was urging that the Committee of Five should not proceed upon its work alone, it was imperative that the work of our Committee of Fifteen should likewise be held in suspense.

Happily, the effort to bring about coöperation was aided by the interest and clear-sightedness of the President of the National Education Association, Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, to whom I went with a simple statement of the situation. At the meeting of the National Education Association in July, that Association, upon her motion, acceded to requests which meanwhile had been made by your President and the President of the American Philological Association, and arranged for the appointment of a Joint Committee of Fifteen from the three Associations.

But large bodies like these move slowly. It was not until November that the new President of the Modern Language Association appointed a committee to represent that body upon the Joint Committee, and not until the present month that I was informed that I had been appointed chairman of that committee, and that the work might now begin.

After consultation with Mr. Rounds, whose attitude has been most cordial, I have appointed a meeting of the committee for Saturday and Sunday next. I have also, at his request, suggested a number of topics which it might be wise for us to take up then, and in addition have prepared a tentative draft, covering nearly the whole field, as a basis for discussion. No time, at any rate, has been lost since it became possible to proceed. I regret only that it was not feasible, in the very limited number of days at command, to ask the coöperation of all the members of the committee in the preparation of this first conspectus.

What remains now is to state how the Joint Committee was made up, and to ask what relation our Committee of Fifteen shall bear to it.

It was foreseen to be probable that the new President of the National Education Association would appoint as representatives the same persons that had been appointed as the Committee of Five under the authority of the Department of Superintendence. That committee consisted of three superintendents of schools,—Mrs.

Young, Mr. Brooks of Boston, and Mr. West of Baltimore,—Mr. Rounds, representing English, and myself. It was evident to your officers that the representatives of your Association should be taken from your Committee of Fifteen; and it was also obvious that the representatives of the American Philological Association should likewise, if possible, be taken in part from that committee. With three places very properly held upon the Joint Committee by representatives of the Department of Superintendence, there remained twelve places for representatives of seven languages. It was clear that there could not be more than two for any one language. It was also clear that, if possible, one of these in each case should be from a school, and the other from a university. I was myself, through being a member of the Committee of Five, already present upon the Joint Committee as a representative of Latin on the university side. There remained then but three men to be appointed for Classics by the American Philological Association, while the other two places must be filled by modern language men,—members if possible of your Committee of Fifteen, who must also, of course, be members of the American Philological Association, which was to appoint them. The number of such common members of the two Associations was small. The limitations were thus very strict. Nevertheless, it proved possible for the Presidents of the two Associations to make such a choice that the Joint Committee as now constituted appears not only to meet the conditions stated, but to be an excellent one in itself,—representing not merely the Department of Superintendence, the languages involved, the school, and the college, but also widely separated parts of the country.

A single change has been made, within a few days, in the representation of the National Education Association. Mr. West has resigned, and Professor A. F. Lange, of the department of Education, the University of California, has been appointed in his place.

The committee, as now constituted, consists of the following members, arranged according to the departments which they especially represent: Superintendence, Ella Flagg Young, Stratton D. Brooks; Education, Alexis F. Lange; English, C. R. Rounds, F. G. Hubbard; German, Edward Spanhoofd, Hermann Collitz; French, Spanish, and Italian, W. B. Snow, B. L. Bowen, E. C. Hills, E. H. Wilkins; Latin, John C. Kirtland, W. G. Hale; Greek, Sidney G. Stacey, Walter Miller.

The other matter is the relation that shall obtain between your Committee of Fifteen and the Joint Committee.

That relation is for the Association, or, if it seems better, for the Executive Council, to determine.

Inasmuch as the entire purpose of the establishment of the Joint

Committee was to bring about community of action, so that there should not be discordant reports, and so that the entire country might be disposed to view the joint report with favor, it would seem best that your Committee of Fifteen should not bring in a separate report conflicting with the report of the Joint Committee. The only way by which the desired result can be assured would appear to be that your Committee of Fifteen should act, as it did in the other work confided to it, through a sub-committee, the members of the sub-committee in the present case to be those eight members of the entire committee (now reduced by resignations to twelve) who are members of the Joint Committee.

This arrangement, further, would lighten the necessarily heavy work of the chairman of the Joint Committee. The English Joint Committee had twenty-four meetings averaging three hours and a quarter each. Nothing of the sort seems to be possible for us. We must work mainly by correspondence. The codification of the material and of the criticism offered by the committee, and the sending out of duplicate statements to fifteen members, is in itself a large task. It would be greatly increased if these statements had to be sent to twenty-one members, and the answers of the two bodies had to be kept distinct. I hold myself at your disposal, nevertheless, to do whatever you think best.

Respectfully submitted,

W. G. HALE.

December 28, 1911.

The report was accepted and its recommendation referred to the Executive Council.

Professor John W. Cunliffe presented the following report of the Committee on the Reproduction of Early Texts:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REPRODUCTION OF EARLY TEXTS.

The Committee has a modified satisfaction in reporting that the reproduction of the Cædmon MS. has been undertaken by the British Academy through the generosity of an English donor. The letter of Professor Gollancz making this announcement is annexed to this report. The chairman of the committee has endeavored to obtain further particulars, but has not as yet succeeded. It is, therefore,